

**Amendment and Response**

Applicant: Timothy S. Wasinger et al.

Serial No.: 09/847,051

Filed: May 1, 2001

Docket No.: PA0528.ap.US

Title: VIDEO GAMING APPARATUS FOR WAGERING WITH UNIVERSAL COMPUTERIZED  
CONTROLLER AND I/O INTERFACE FOR UNIQUE ARCHITECTURE

---

**REMARKS**

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed November 4, 2003. Claims 1-26 were rejected. With this Response, claims 1, 18, 19, and 20 have been amended. Claims 1-26 remain pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103**

Claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 12, 13, 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Miller, U.S. Patent No. 6,322,445 (hereinafter "Miller"). Claims 4, 5, 8-11 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller in view of Carlson, U.S. 5,707,286 (hereinafter "Carlson"). Claims 14, 15 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller in view of Farago, U.S. Patent No. 4,792,470 (hereinafter "Farago"). Claims 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller in view of Mardsen et al., Development of a PC-Windows Based Universal Control System, 5<sup>th</sup> Intl. Conf. on FACTORY 2000, 2-4 April, 1997, Conf. Pub. No. 435 (hereinafter "Mardsen") and Green, U.S. Patent No. 5,954,583 (hereinafter "Green"). Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller in view of Dabrowski, U.S. Patent No. 6,379,246 (hereinafter "Dabrowski"). Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller. Applicants submit that Miller, either alone or in combination with Carlson, Farago, Mardsen, Green, or Dabrowski does not teach or suggest the invention of claims 1-26.

Independent claim 1 recites a computerized wagering gaming system. The system comprises a universal computerized gaming system, game system devices, and a game translator system. The universal computerized game system is operable to control a computerized wagering game, and includes a controller interface and a universal controller for processing game and operating system instructions. The game translator system translates game events between the game system devices and the universal game control system, wherein the controller interface operates as an interface between the universal controller and the game translator system and comprises a universal controller bus interface and a game translator system interface.

**Amendment and Response**

Applicant: Timothy S. Wasinger et al.

Serial No.: 09/847,051

Filed: May 1, 2001

Docket No.: PA0528.ap.US

Title: VIDEO GAMING APPARATUS FOR WAGERING WITH UNIVERSAL COMPUTERIZED CONTROLLER AND I/O INTERFACE FOR UNIQUE ARCHITECTURE

---

Miller discloses a video gaming machine 100, including a main processing module 301, an I/O module 305, user interface units 220, and a system communication bus 304. (Column 5, lines 5-35). System communications bus 304 typically uses a PCI type system bus for implementation. (Column 5, lines 7-9). Applicants submit that Miller does not teach the **computerized wagering and gaming system** of independent claim 1. Miller fails to disclose a **controller interface, which operates as an interface between the universal controller and the game translator system and comprises a universal controller bus interface and a game translator system interface**. The Examiner suggests that the system communication bus 304 of Miller teaches the controller interface 308 of the current invention. (See Office Action, page 3). Applicants submit that the communication bus 304 of Miller does not disclose controller interface 308, since controller interface 308 also includes a universal controller bus interface and a game translator system interface. A PCI type system bus such as system communication bus 304 in Miller cannot perform the functions of the controller interface 308 in the present invention.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that Miller does not teach the invention of independent claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that the above rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 2-17 depend directly or indirectly upon independent claim 1. Accordingly, dependent claims 2-17 are also allowable over the art of record.

In further reference to dependent claim 2, Miller does not teach that **the controller interface further comprises data bus drivers in communication with the universal game controller**. The communication bus in Miller does not comprise data bus drivers either explicitly or implicitly.

In further reference to dependent claim 3, Miller does not teach that **the controller interface further comprises an address decoder**. The communication bus in Miller does not comprise an address decoder either explicitly or implicitly.

In further reference to dependent claim 4, neither Miller nor Carlson teach or suggest **the controller interface further comprises nonvolatile random access memory**. While Carlson

**Amendment and Response**

Applicant: Timothy S. Wasinger et al.

Serial No.: 09/847,051

Filed: May 1, 2001

Docket No.: PA0528.ap.US

Title: VIDEO GAMING APPARATUS FOR WAGERING WITH UNIVERSAL COMPUTERIZED CONTROLLER AND I/O INTERFACE FOR UNIQUE ARCHITECTURE

---

teaches using nonvolatile memory, it does not teach or suggest using nonvolatile random access memory in a controller interface.

In further reference to dependent claim 5, neither Miller nor Carlson teach or suggest **the controller interface further comprises read only memory for storing gaming system programs**. While Carlson teaches using read only memory, it does not teach or suggest using read only memory in a controller interface.

In further reference to dependent claim 6, Miller does not teach that **the controller interface further comprises an identification module, having an identifier unique to the gaming system**. The communication bus in Miller does not comprise a unique identifier.

Miller also does not teach or suggest the claimed recitations in independent claim 18. Independent claim 18 recites a computerized wagering gaming system. The system includes a universal computerized game system, game system devices, and a game translator system. The universal computerized game system operates to control a computerized wagering game, including a controller interface and a universal controller for processing game and operating system instructions. The controller interface operates as an interface between the universal controller and the game translator system and comprises a universal controller bus interface and a game translator system interface. For at least the reasons stated above with reference to independent claim 1, Miller does not teach or suggest these claimed recitations. Applicants respectfully submit the above rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) should be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 24-26 depend directly upon independent claim 18. Accordingly, dependent claims 24-26 are also allowable over the art of record.

Miller either alone or in combination with Mardsen and Green, does not teach or suggest the claimed recitations in independent claim 19. Independent claim 19 recites a method for reconfiguring a computerized wagering game apparatus having a harness for associating memory with output devices in the apparatus. The method includes removing an original special-purpose computerized game controller used to control a computerized wagering game from the apparatus, the original computerized game controller designed to and capable of working exclusively with a particular computerized wagering game apparatus; inserting a computerized wagering gaming

**Amendment and Response**

Applicant: Timothy S. Wasinger et al.

Serial No.: 09/847,051

Filed: May 1, 2001

Docket No.: PA0528.ap.US

Title: VIDEO GAMING APPARATUS FOR WAGERING WITH UNIVERSAL COMPUTERIZED CONTROLLER AND I/O INTERFACE FOR UNIQUE ARCHITECTURE

---

system including a universal computerized game system operable to control a computerized wagering game, including a controller interface and a universal controller for processing game and operating system instruction, and a game translator system for translating game events between game system devices and the universal game control system, wherein the controller interface operates as an interface between the universal controller and the game translator system and comprises a universal controller bus interface and a game translator system interface.

Miller either alone or in combination with Mardsen and Green does not teach or suggest **a controller interface where the controller interface operates as an interface between the universal controller and the game translator system and comprises a universal controller bus interface and a game translator system interface.** The Examiner admits that Mardsen does not teach or suggest “retrofitting a gaming machine; and installing a translator module for translating events between system devices and the controller wherein the controller interface operates as an interface between the universal controller and the translator.” (See Office Action, page 7).

Mardsen discloses the use of universal controllers and input/output modules for industrial applications. Green discloses a secure access control system for use in gaming establishments such as casinos. Neither Mardsen nor Green teach a method for reconfiguring a computerized wagering game apparatus having a harness for associating memory with output devices in the apparatus and removing the original special purpose computerized game controller used to control the computerized wagering game from the apparatus, the original computerized game controller designed to and capable of working exclusively with a particular computerized wagering game apparatus; inserting a computerized wagering game system including a universal computerized game system operable to control a computerized wagering game, wherein the controller interface comprises a universal controller bus interface and a game translator system interface. For at least these reasons and the reasons stated above in reference to claim 1, Miller either alone or in combination with Mardsen and Green, does not teach or suggest these claimed recitations. Applicants respectfully submit the above rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be withdrawn.

**Amendment and Response**

Applicant: Timothy S. Wasinger et al.

Serial No.: 09/847,051

Filed: May 1, 2001

Docket No.: PA0528.ap.US

Title: VIDEO GAMING APPARATUS FOR WAGERING WITH UNIVERSAL COMPUTERIZED  
CONTROLLER AND I/O INTERFACE FOR UNIQUE ARCHITECTURE

---

Miller either alone or in combination with Mardsen and Green, also does not teach or suggest the claimed recitations in independent claim 20. Independent claim 20 recites a process for modifying game controls in a casino wagering system. The process includes removing a motherboard from a gaming apparatus comprising a housing, a monitor, a motherboard comprising memory for executing game rules and game rules; and replacing the motherboard with a computerized wagering gaming system including a universal computerized game system operable to control a computerized wagering game, including a controller interface and a universal controller for processing game and operating system instructions, and a game translator system for translating game events between game system devices and the universal game control system, wherein the controller interface operates as an interface between the universal controller and the game translator system and comprises a universal controller bus interface and a game translator system interface.

For at least the reasons stated above in reference to claims 1 and 19, Miller either alone or in combination with Mardsen and Green, does not teach or suggest these claimed recitations. Applicants respectfully submit the above rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 21-23 depend directly upon independent claim 20. Accordingly, these dependent claims are allowable over the art of record.

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the above, Applicant believes independent claims 1, 18, 19, and 20 and the claims depending therefrom, are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

No fees are required under 37 C.F.R. 1.16(b)(c). However, if such fees are required, the Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 500471.

The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' Representative at the below-listed telephone number if there are any questions regarding this response.

Respectfully submitted,

Timothy S. Wasinger et al.,